

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 9, 11, and 13 to 22 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 9 and 13 to 16 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 9 and 13 to 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,335,863 (“DeGrace”). It is respectfully submitted that DeGrace does not anticipate these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 9 relates to a fuel injector for a fuel-injection system of an internal combustion engine, including: a solenoid coil; a tubular support acting as an inner pole of the solenoid coil; and a filter element affixed on an outer contour of the tubular support. The outer contour of the tubular support includes grooves, the tubular support includes a shoulder on a discharge side of the grooves, and the shoulder extends radially outward beyond outer edges of the grooves.

DeGrace does not disclose, or even suggest, that an outer contour of a tubular support includes grooves. **As is apparent from Fig. 5 of DeGrace, adjusting tube 30’, which the Final Office Action apparently considers to constitute a tubular support, includes one external groove (58) on its outer contour, and not a plurality of grooves as provided by the above-mentioned feature.** In addition, DeGrace does not disclose, or even suggest, that a shoulder, which is part of the tubular support and is situated on a discharge side of the grooves, extends radially outward beyond outer edges of the grooves. **Contrary to the assertion appearing in the last four lines of page 2 of the Final Office Action, a lower surface of groove (58), which the Final Office Action apparently contends to constitute a shoulder, is a part of the groove (58) and does not extend radially outward beyond outer edges of the groove (58), but only extends radially to an outer edge of the groove (58).** Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that DeGrace does not anticipate claim 9 for at least these reasons.

As for claims 13 to 16, which ultimately depend from claim 9 and therefore include all of the features of claim 9, it is respectfully submitted that

DeGrace does not anticipate these dependent claims for at least the reasons set forth above.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 11 and 17 to 22 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 11 and 17 to 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over DeGrace. It is respectfully submitted that DeGrace does not render these claims unpatentable for at least the following reasons.

Regarding claim 22, this claim includes features analogous to claim 9. In addition, as set forth in detail in Section II of this response, DeGrace does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 9. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that DeGrace does not render unpatentable claim 22 for at least these reasons.

Claims 11 and 17 to 21 ultimately depend from claim 9 and therefore include all of the features of claim 9. As set forth above, DeGrace does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 9. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that DeGrace does not render unpatentable claims 11 and 17 to 21, which ultimately depend from claim 9.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Dated: March 2, 2009

Respectfully submitted,
By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/

Clifford A. Ulrich, Reg. No. 42,194 for
Gerard A. Messina (Reg. No. 35,952)
KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646